

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/619,854	07/15/2003	Michael A. Mitchell	29827/39446 7736		
4743 7590 05/30/2007 MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP					
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300			BOGART, MICHAEL G		
SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3761		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/619,854	MITCHELL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Michael G. Bogart	3761	

	Michael G. Bogart	3761					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 07 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	Appeal. To avoid aba īdavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed. 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	acted claims					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	⊠ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi ovided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: 32-36 and 79-81.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>37-57,77 and 78</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
 12. ☑ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other: 	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>200705</u>	<u>25</u>					
TATYANA ZALUKAEVA SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER							
Wall Land							
	//N 000 /_	16	ワ				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20070525

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants' proposed amendment to claim 32 adds quantitative limitations as to how much water the may be absorbed by the acidic resin in a neutralized form and a basic resin in a charged form. These performance limitations substantively narrow the scope of the claimed invention and would require further consideration and/or search. Applicants' proposed amendment to the abstract would overcome the objections of the Office action dated 23 January 2007.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments are based upon proposed amendnts to the claims that have not been entered. Applicants' assert that WO 96/151180 discloses a cationic suberabsorbent in error, and that it should have been described as an anion exchanger. As an example presented soley in response to applicants' arguments presented after the final rejection, Palumbo WO 96/17681 A1, not made of record, teaches substantially the same invention as '180 and has the same inventor and assignee as '180. The '681 reference expressly discloses in its abstract a superabsorbent material having a combination of an anionic superabsorbent and a cationic superabsorbent. Furthermore, Adachi et al. US 2005/0049379 A1, not made of record, shows a water absorbent resin where a cationic superabsorbent is equated to an anion exchanger (paragraph 0018). The recitiation of a cationic superabsorbent in the '180 reference thus appears to not be an error.